



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,916	10/24/2003	Michael Roberts	00216-368005	9057
26161	7590	05/19/2006		
FISH & RICHARDSON PC				
P.O. BOX 1022				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
			EXAMINER	
			SPISICH, MARK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1744	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,916

Applicant(s)

ROBERTS ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Spisich

Art Unit

1744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 55 and 57-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 55 and 57-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***INTRODUCTION***

A Request for a pre (appeal) brief conference was filed 2 February 2006, the result of which was to re-open prosecution.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 55, 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 1-72128 (hereinafter '128) in view of Dolinsky (USP 4,288,883) and Chen (USP 5,334,646). '128 discloses an oral brush comprising a handle (3) with a head portion (1) at an end thereof and which head portion includes a brush portion including a plurality of non-elastomeric (nylon) bristles as well as a plurality of elastomeric bristles (page 5, line 28 thru page 6, line 4 of the attached translation). The preferred (or at least one of the two) elastomer may be either polyester based or polystyrene based thermoplastic elastomer (see page 4 of the attached translation) or block copolymers. With regard to the "radiused terminal end" (claim 55, line 7), the patent to Dolinsky discloses rubber massage members (22a) (column 1, lines 46-50) with rounded or radiused terminal ends (fig 4 and column 2, lines 26-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have rounded the ends of the bristles (both elastomeric as well as conventional) of '128 to reduce any damage to the user's gums. With regard to the particular material,

Art Unit: 1744

the patent to Chen discloses the recited material (styrene-ethylene-butylene-styrene block copolymer, abstract, lines 1-4) along with a plasticizing oil which is further recognized by Chen as being used in a dental floss (column 7, lines 18-41). It is further pointed out that '128 discloses that the same engineering elastomer that is used to make up the elastomeric member on the oral brush may also be used as dental floss (in the translation, the last paragraph of page 4 as well as lines 9-13 of page 6). It would thus have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have chosen the material of Chen to comprise the elastomeric members (eg, 12) of '128 in that (1) '128 discloses the genus of the recited material and (2) Chen discloses the recited material used in the same environment. It has further been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. With regard to the hardness, the prior art is also used as an oral brush and that one of ordinary skill would deem it obvious to select material that would not hard the user's gums or teeth.

3. Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 1-72128, Dolinsky (USP 4,288,883) and Chen (USP 5,334,646) as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Muhler et al (USP 3,616,143). The prior art discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of the non-elastomeric (nylon) bristles including an abrasive. The patent to Muhler discloses an oral brush including plastic (nylon; column 3, line 26) including a dental abrasive (column 3, line 15) and having a diameter of 8 mil (column 8, line 44). It would have

Art Unit: 1744

been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have modified the non-elastomeric (nylon) bristles of '128 as such to me effectively clean and polish tooth surfaces.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Spisich whose telephone number is (571) 272-1278. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (5:30-3:00), Alternate Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mark Spisich  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1744